

We have State regulations for this program, but we also recognize the purpose of the program is to educate children. When it is necessary to make those regulations flexible to better provide for boys and girls, we do it on our State programs.

We feel we should have the same right of flexibility on Federal regulations in the interest of boys and girls. For example, a regulation in the State is this: that no mother, no parent, may teach in a class or be a teacher's aid in a class where her child is in attendance. That might be all right for 90 percent of the cases.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a question.

From your experience as a State school superintendent, as long as we have this categorical program, how could you more equitably, on the basis of need, reach the needy youngster than we are reaching the needy youngster at the present time, as long as we have this categorical approach. That is my question.

Mr. PAGE. I am afraid that I could not give you a formula at this moment that would do that. I do believe, however, under Mr. Goodell's questioning in regard to the States allocating funds to the counties and to the districts within the counties, I believe we would be in a better position to require quality in relationship to the programs and projects implemented under this act than we might otherwise.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to point out for the record that I was talking about the terms of equalization, with the State having discretion to allocate money locally on the basis of need in contrast with the present law which specifically allocates it to the school district, if it is available, and if not available to the county, on the basis of the number of youngsters from poor families plus additional factors such as ADC and other things that we have added since.

But again, the data in most cases, the number of poor youngsters, is based on 1959 situations. You have a double inflexibility: One, the law is very specific on the formula distributing to the county at minimum and, if possible, to the school district the specific amount of money; and secondly, the inflexibility is based largely on data of 1959 origin which does produce a great many distortions in our society today where we have so much mobility and changing population.

Let me make a brief comment with reference to the considerable discussion about this problem of early allocation or early money. I think all of us are concerned about this problem. We would like to work out a way to give you adequate information in advance as to how much money you are going to have.

When we are talking about a year or two advance notice to each State, I think we must do it in the context of the realities here in Congress. I think it is very unlikely that we will ever reach the stage where the appropriation process will be committed to a period longer than 1 year.

I think in all likelihood, you are going to have to run through the appropriation process at least every year. Now, there is a problem for a legislative committee handing over a program simply to the appropriations subcommittee involved.